

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 25 is amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments or the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 1-21 and 24 define patentable subject matter. However, for at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims define patentable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 22-23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over US Patent No. 6,031,866 to Oler et al. (hereafter "Oler"). Since Oler fails to disclose or suggest features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that at least features of a receiver including a first feedback canceler to cancel postcursor-inter-symbol interference (ISI) caused by a preceding symbol, a second feedback canceler to cancel precursor-ISI caused by a trailing symbol, wherein the first and second feedback cancellers use a same set of decision feedback equalizer (DFE) coefficients to cancel the postcursor-ISI and precursor-ISI and combinations thereof as recited in claim 23 are not disclosed or suggested by Oler.

In contrast, Oler discloses a transmitter section 12 includes a forward filter 16 that is defined by first coefficients selected to reduce precursor intersymbol interference. See Figure 1 and column 5, lines 15-22 of Oler.

Oler discloses a receiver section 14 includes a base equalizer 28 formed of a DFE 32 and forward filter 34. See Figure 4 of Oler. The DFE 32 reduces postcursor intersymbol interference. See column 5, lines 51-52 of Oler. The forward filter 34 is defined by filter coefficients selected to reduce precursor intersymbol interference. See column 5, lines 59-61 of Oler.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the forward filter 16 and the forward filter 34 reduce precursor intersymbol interference. Under certain conditions (the channel is essentially

reciprocal over a short time), the filter coefficients for the forward filters 16 and 34 may be the same. See column 5, lines 62-64, column 8, lines 18-21 and claims 1-2 (first and second forward filters) of Oler.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Oler does not teach or suggest at least features of first and second feedback cancellers.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Oler does not teach or suggest at least features of a first feedback canceler to cancel postcursor-ISI, a second feedback canceler to cancel precursor-ISI, wherein the first and second feedback cancellers use a same set of DFE coefficients to cancel the postcursor-ISI and precursor-ISI and combinations thereof as recited in claim 23.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Oler does not teach or suggest any modification to their disclosure that would result in at least the features of a first and second feedback cancelers and combinations thereof as recited in claim 23.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 defines patentable subject matter. Claim 22 defines patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 23. Claim 25 depends from claim 22 and therefore also defines patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as its additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Carl Wesolowski, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is

Serial No. 10/690,629

Docket No. GCTS-0036

Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2008

hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-4574 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
MUIR PATENT CONSULTING, PLLC



Carl R. Wesolowski, Esq.
Registration No. 40,372

758 Walker Road Suite C
Great Falls, VA 22066

703 757-7880

Date: AUGUST 4, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 74,712